other Indians rather late. The Washo never kept horses until sometime after 1850. In 1844 the Fremont party (Nevins 1956, 348) put a Washo on a horse and "enjoyed the unusual sight of an Indian who could not ride. He could not even guide the animal, and appeared to have no knowledge of horses." Fremont was given a Washo guide, a boy they called Malo (meaning "friend"), who was selected because he had seen Whites. Later on in the same year Hamilton's trapping party met Paiutes on the Carson River that had a few horses, understood a little Spanish, and had a few Spanish flintlock guns (Sieber 1951, 155-6).

In 1852 a band of Washo were reported in the possession of several American horses near Eagle Station (Thompson and West 1881, 147) while Major G. W. Ingalls (1913, 26) wrote that the Washo had no horses in 1859. Lowie (1939, 302) collected the following story about Washo contact with Whites.

"According to Dave, the first whites from the East reached the site of Wadsworth in the fall of the year on their way to California, driving mule, ox, or horse teams. There were many of them, and they did not halt. Women were in the emigrant wagon. One ox got away and was tended by the Indians, who rode and packed him, finally killing him for the meat, which they divided among the band."

In the late 1800's sweeping changes of the natural and social scene were wrought by mining, lumbering, farming, grazing, commercial fishing, tourism, and the growth of towns. By 1900 the Washo were culturally "reservation Indians," but without a reservation or a treaty with the U.S. Government. They had been alloted about 64,000 acres of land in the Pine Nut Hills as a pinenut reserve. In addition, about 30 Washo families each received trust lands in California, especially in Alpine County, under the General Allotment Act of 1887 and other later acts. The usual size for these "Indian homesteads" was 80 acres. These lands in California totaled 2,600 acres in 1945.

In 1917 the site of the Dresslerville Colony was obtained and in 1938 and 1940 three ranches were purchased adjacent to the colony for the Washo. The ranches were run by the Washo for several years. Political troubles within the tribe forced them to lease to White ranchers. In addition, the Carson Colony of 160 acres was purchased for the Washo in 1940 (Realty Office, Carson Indian Agency).

Today Washo income comes mainly from wage work along with some rentals, social security, relief, and craftwork. Most of the wage work of the Washo living in Dresslerville and Woodfords is connected with farm and ranch work. With 100 years of association with Nevada ranch life, many Washo Indians are skilled ranch hands. However, none of the Washo own sizable farms or ranches today. With military service and World War II defense plant experience a number of Washo, particularly those residing in Carson City and Reno, have moved into skilled trades.

344 177 [668] was performed (Dangberg n.d.). This eight sided structure and the nine sided "round house" built around 1940 by Ben Lancaster for meetings of the Native American Church near Coleville, California were innovations and not part of traditional Washo architecture.

Property and Inheritance

423 Washo groups had no communal property beyond the land they lived on and its resources. Some joint ownership of property occurred however. The kin group's common rights in specific pinenut picking grounds (dimasha) and eagle nests (petaimi mɬgi) are a form of joint property. Steward (1938, 256) described family ownership of pinenut groves among the Owens Valley Paiute, a rarity within the Great Basin.

The Washo thought of themselves as co-users of the territory along with the plants, animals, and a host of supernaturals. The rights of these other users had to be respected. Individuals or households could establish semi-permanent exclusive rights over specific locations for use purposes. A fish blind constructed over a deep place along a stream established the right of the person or household that had constructed it to fish in that [425] area. When the fish blind was abandoned for the season anyone else could use it; but the person who made the fish blind had established a right to return to that spot the following year.

422 [782] Food or manufactured goods could be used or exchanged, but not destroyed. The exception to this was ceremonial disposal where there was a ritual requirement to destroy the goods (see p.47). Also individuals who infringed upon others' traditional pinenut picking grounds may have their baskets and [685] other gathering equipment destroyed for them by the rightful owners of that picking ground.

A connection was believed to obtain between the objects and the persons who made them. In Washo society every manufactured object was personalized [768] in this way. The intimate connection between objects and persons is seen [431] in the abandonment or destruction of the goods a deceased individual had made, even if the goods had been given to someone else. In a sense, the maker always maintained partial ownership in any objects he produced.

621 423 Each Washo local group owned for use-purposes the hunting territory, fishing streams, and springs that it actually used. If the members of a cluster of cooperating households regularly hunted in a certain area, their right to exclusive hunting in that area emerged over time. Informants say that a person had a theoretical right to hunt anywhere, but in practice he hunted in a fairly limited area. This was in part due to the accessibility of the hunting area with regard to a group's habitual wintering grounds. It was also due to the intimate knowledge that a hunter gains of a limited section of the total hunting territory. But it also derived from the concept of local group prerogatives, and the necessity to receive permission when intruding upon recognized sub-territories.

Pinenut pickinggrounds and eagle aeries were owned for exclusive use purposes by kinship groups. It appears that these traditional forms of private ownership developed as an institutionalization of the personalization of property and rights obtained through use. 423 621 596

Inheritance is a transfer of ownership from a deceased person to a living person or persons. It is based on a pre-existing relationship between the deceased and his successors, is personal, and usually traditional (Hoebel 1958, 458). Generally in primitive societies inheritance of chattel goods follows the sexual division because the distinction between men and women's goods is so complete. Also land tenure is generally communal with some kinship and residence group modification. 428

Among the Washo the complete destruction of a person's goods at his death precludes inheritance of chattel property. Real estate is essentially communal and for the tribe, inalienable. Hank Pete said that when "Captain Jim" (Gumalanga) received two sacks of flour for the land around the present town of Genoa, Nevada from John Reese in 1851 he had no concept of alienating the land. John Reese thought he had bought land while Captain Jim thought he had merely received a gift in exchange for providing the strangers temporary use of lands. 423 [768] [422] [425] [648]

Though modification of the communal nature of real estate came in the case of pinenut groves and eagle aeries, this modification is not subject to inheritance in the full sense. It is more a heritage by virtue of birth, rather than inheritance by virtue of death. There was, for example, no transfer of ownership of eagle nests when a person died; individuals, however, referred to their relationship with the deceased in order to reaffirm their rights to the baby eagles. 428 423 178

Division and Specialization of Labor

Division of labor within the household called for the women to do the general gathering of seeds, nuts, roots, berries, and insects. The women cooked, made baskets, and tended the children. The men hunted, carried water, gathered firewood, prepared the skins, and made most of the clothing, fiber cords, rabbit skin blankets, rabbit nets, and hunting and fishing gear. Men and women both gathered pinenuts, fished, and worked in the construction of houses. This division of duties was not rigid so that each sex knew and participated in activities of the other sex. 462

Division of labor by age was related to ability and the development of skills. Soon after a child began to walk he was given small tasks to do and ability and responsibility was expected to increase gradually with age. By puberty the individual was a full contributor to the household. With old age the more sedentary crafts such as basketry and net making were emphasized. [868] [887] [463]